UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,155	11/12/2003	Erol Bozak	09700.0034-00	8251
	7590 12/23/200 ENDERSON, FARAE	8 SOW, GARRETT & DUNNER	EXAMINER	
LLP			FORD, GRANT M	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2441	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/712,155	BOZAK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	GRANT FORD	2441
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions a finite or period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be not will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS froute, cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, p	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-13 is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination of the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ and	wn from consideration. I/or election requirement. ner.	· Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ection is required if the drawing(s) is o	bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a limit	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applica riority documents have been receive eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ition No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summan Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/712,155 Page 2

Art Unit: 2441

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/9/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/9/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 under the prior art of Naik have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Allon, as outlined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/712,155 Page 3

Art Unit: 2441

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naik et al. (US 2006/0294238), hereinafter referred to as Naik, in view of Allon et al. (5,539,883), hereinafter referred to as Allon.

a. As per claim 1, Naik discloses a method for managing a client server network, said method comprising:

maintaining systems of grid managers in a grid computing environment, wherein said grid managers have hierarchical relations and storing, in each of the systems, the relations of each grid manager (Figure 1, Para. 0048-0052); and

dynamically reconfiguring resource allocations in the grid computing environment to maintain a predetermined resource allocation level (Para. 0105, 0112, 0114-0116, 0122). However, Naik fails to explicitly disclose dynamic reconfiguration of resource allocations by changing hierarchical relations between nodes.

Allon teaches dynamic reconfiguration of resource allocations by changing hierarchical relations between nodes (Col. 5 lines 3-46). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of dynamic reconfiguration of resource allocations by changing hierarchical relations between nodes with the prior art of Naik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing for changing hierarchical ordering in the event of a failure of a node such that dynamic reconfiguration may restructure a load balancing tree.

b. As per claim 2, Naik additionally discloses wherein each of the relations are classified as superior or inferior (Para. 0048-0052).

Application/Control Number: 10/712,155 Page 4

Art Unit: 2441

c. As per claim 3, Naik discloses a system comprising:

a network of computer system s, each of the computer systems including a grid manager having hierarchical relations with other grid managers, the relations of each grid manager being stored in each of the systems (Figure 1, Para. 0048-0052); and

a dynamic resource allocator for reconfiguring computer resources in the network of computer systems to maintain a predetermined resource allocation level (Para. 0105, 0112, 0114-0116, 0122). However, Naik fails to explicitly disclose dynamic reconfiguration of resource allocations by changing hierarchical relations between nodes.

Allon teaches dynamic reconfiguration of resource allocations by changing hierarchical relations between nodes (Col. 5 lines 3-46). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of dynamic reconfiguration of resource allocations by changing hierarchical relations between nodes with the prior art of Naik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing for changing hierarchical ordering in the event of a failure of a node such that dynamic reconfiguration may restructure a load balancing tree.

d. As per claim 4, Naik additionally discloses wherein each of the relations are classified as superior or inferior (Para. 0048-0052).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GRANT FORD whose telephone number is (571)272-8630. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30 Mon-Thurs alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Caldwell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/G. F./ Examiner, Art Unit 2441